## 2010-119 AUDIT SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES—Commission on Teacher Credentialing

The Bureau of State Audits will provide independently developed and verified information related to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) and its disciplinary process for the period from 2007 to the present, and to the extent possible, will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- 1. Review and evaluate the laws, rules, and regulations significant to the audit objectives.
- 2. Review and evaluate the Commission's policies, procedures, and practices for processing allegations or reports and investigating alleged misconduct by applicants. Further, determine whether the Commission's practices ensure these allegations or reports are thoroughly addressed in a timely manner by conducting the audit steps below.
- 3. Assess the accuracy and completeness of the Commission's database as it relates to disciplinary process information, focusing on the accuracy of recorded receipt dates on reports and documents. Further, determine whether changes or adjustments made to the records in the database are adequately supported.
- 4. Determine the number and types of reports, such as a report of a criminal conviction from a law enforcement agency or court, a report from a school district, a personal affidavit, a self-report, or licensing action, that were received and processed by the Commission.
- 5. Determine whether the Commission had any backlogs of reports alleging teacher misconduct. If such backlogs existed, identify and evaluate the cause(s), any relevant trends, and the Commission's efforts to address these backlogs.
- 6. For allegations reviewed by the Committee of Credentials (Committee), determine and analyze the amount of time that elapsed between key steps in the process. Examples of potential key steps should include the Commission's initial receipt of a report, the Commission's Division of Professional Practices' (Division) initial receipt, initial follow-up with school districts, and any action taken by the Commission.
- 7. Determine and evaluate the amount of time that elapsed before the Division sought documentation after receiving multiple reports on a single credential holder. Further, evaluate the Division's efforts to investigate school district reports while a criminal matter on the same credential holder was awaiting review.
- 8. Review and assess the following information related to criminal reports received by Commission staff:
  - (a) The amount of time that elapsed between the Commission's receipt of information from the Department of Justice and Federal Bureau of Investigation, and its final action in cases in which the Commission must automatically revoke credentials.

- (b) The amount of time that elapsed between the Commission's receipt of criminal convictions information and its requests for further documentation.
- (c) The consistency with which the Commission requested and obtained relevant law enforcement reports. If the Commission did not obtain these reports, determine the reason why.
- (d) The number of allegations involving criminal conviction reports that were closed without review by the Committee and identify the reasons for the closures.
- 9. Determine the number of recommendations of adverse action by the Committee. In those cases where the Committee recommended adverse action, determine how many credential holders and applicants requested an administrative hearing before the Commission acted on that recommendation.
- 10. Identify the number of reports and allegations that were not pursued because time-based statutes prevented their further pursuit.
- 11. Determine the number and age of reports and allegations not reviewed by the Committee. Further, determine and analyze the reason the reports and allegations were not reviewed by the Committee, and whether they followed established policy in reaching these determinations.
- 12. Determine the Commission's current policies and practices as they relate to the hiring of family members. Additionally, survey Commission staff regarding any familial relationships, nepotism and employee favoritism, and their impact on the Commission's hiring practices and the staff's ability to work without fear of reprisal for filing a complaint.